The Role of Social Scientists in Synthetic Biology

Citation for published version:
Calvert, J & Martin, P 2009, 'The Role of Social Scientists in Synthetic Biology', *EMBO Reports*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 201-204. https://doi.org/10.1038/embor.2009.15

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):
10.1038/embor.2009.15

Link:
Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Published In:
EMBO Reports

The role of social scientists in synthetic biology

Jane Calvert and Paul Martin

Published as: Calvert, J., & Martin, P. (2009). The Role of Social Scientists in Synthetic Biology. EMBO Reports, 10(3), 201-204doi: 10.1038/embor.2009.15

Social scientists can adopt many different roles and responsibilities when they study scientific research: they can be advocates, intermediaries, translators, connoisseurs, critics, activists, or reformers. They can reflect on the implications of a finished piece of research, or become involved at a much earlier stage. In newly emerging areas of scientific research, we are seeing novel arrangements forming among natural and social scientists, whereby social scientists are becoming a required component of research programmes, and are even involved in the creation of new fields. Our aim here is to explore these developments and examine the different possible roles that social scientists may play in debates about new technologies by using the example of synthetic biology.

Synthetic biology is a 'field in the making' that combines the expertise and knowledge of biologists and engineers. It is accompanied by both high expectations and considerable uncertainty; there are major debates about its definition, its potential applications, safety considerations and how it should be institutionalised. In common with other emerging areas of technology and science, synthetic biology covers a broad and disparate set of research activities, and there is as yet no consensus on how the field should be defined; although the most common definitions of synthetic biology emphasise both the building of new biological entities and the improvement of existing ones. A group at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT: Cambridge, MA, USA), for example, defines synthetic biology as "the design and construction of new biological parts, devices, and systems and the re-design of existing, natural biological systems for useful purposes" (www.syntheticbiology.org).

In practice, many different activities are pursued under the heading of synthetic biology (O'Malley et al., 2008), including the construction of interchangeable biological parts and devices—often called BioBricks™—the generation and modification of whole genomes, including the synthesis of viral genomes from scratch and the reduction of existing bacterial genomes, and attempts to create 'protocells' from simple components. Given the range of work that describes itself as 'synthetic biology', it is hard to strictly delimit the field at present.

Many synthetic biologists aspire to make biology into an engineering discipline. By explicitly adopting engineering principles, such as standardisation, decoupling and abstraction, these synthetic biologists distinguish their work from previous genetic engineering (Endy, 2005). The possible practical applications of synthetic biology include the production of biofuels, new tools for bioremediation, biosensors, *in vivo* health applications, new drug development pathways, synthetic vaccines and biobased manufacturing (ITI Life Sciences, 2007). Most notably, synthetic biologists have already generated a genetically modified bacterium that produces a precursor for the antimalarial drug artemisinin (Ro et al., 2006).

Although synthetic biologists distinguish their work from genetic engineering, it is undeniable that this new field gives rise to similar fears, which means that there is already an established set of anxieties to which synthetic biology relates. Both genetic engineering and synthetic biology involve the modification of living organisms, which, by definition, are selfpropagating. But synthetic biology adds a new dimension because the development of the internet and the routinisation of many biotechnological procedures have made the field more easily accessible (Garfinkel et al., 2007). For instance, MIT organizes an undergraduate competition each year where students 'programme' bacteria to perform certain functions (www.igem.org). In this way, we see the potential 'domestication' or 'deskilling' of biotechnology, which is leading to concerns about 'garage biology' and 'biohackers'.

However, many of these concerns are rather anticipatory. Most of the current work in synthetic biology is funded by public institutions rather than large companies; an indication that much of it is still far from being suitable for commercial exploitation or routine application (De Vriend, 2006). Perhaps all that we can be sure of is that the rapidly increasing speed and the equally decreasing cost of DNA synthesis will accelerate the progress of experimental research in the biological sciences (Endy, 2005).

Although there is no consensus on the definition of synthetic biology, there is a widespread conviction that it has important ethical, legal and social implications (ELSI), and that these should be explicitly addressed. Most reports about the field rehearse a standard list of these implications of synthetic biology, which include concerns about biosafety, biosecurity, intellectual property and the status of 'nature'.

What is particularly interesting about this new field is the fact that the scientific community is aware that their research has the potential to be extremely contentious, and many scientists regularly write about and publicly discuss regulatory, social and ethical issues. For example, at the Second International Conference on Synthetic Biology in 2006 in Berkeley, CA, USA, the participants put forward a declaration on governance of the field, which focused on biosecurity issues and emphasized self-regulation. However, this met with negative responses from a global coalition of civil society organizations, who wrote an open letter stating that "we believe that this potentially powerful technology is being developed without proper societal debate concerning socio-economic, security, health, environmental and human rights implications" and emphasised the necessity for broad and inclusive public debate (ETC Group, 2006).

One response to such concerns about synthetic biology has been to institutionalise the involvement of social scientists in the field. There have been a series of initiatives in which ELSI activities have become purposely incorporated into synthetic biology discussion and research. In the UK, four research councils have funded seven scientific networks in synthetic biology that require an ELSI component. The Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC; Swindon, UK) explains this decision by stating that "[i]t is very important that ethical and other social issues are identified at this early stage in the development of Synthetic Biology, before new products and processes are made, so that research funders and researchers can take these into consideration" (BBSRC, 2008).

Similarly, the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme funds a project called SYNBIOSAFE, which "aims to proactively stimulate a debate on these issues" (http://www.synbiosafe.eu/). The introduction on the project's website states that "[i]n order to ensure a vital and successful development of this new scientific field—in addition to describ[ing] the potential benefits—it is absolutely necessary to gather information also about the risks and to devise possible biosafety strategies to minimize them". The overall goal of SYBNIOSAFE is to create "the framework within which Europe's fledgling synthetic biology industry can flourish". In particular, SYBNIOSAFE cites the ongoing debate about GM crops as an example of how this has failed in the past: “Past experiences, especially in the field of GM-crops, have shown the importance of an early bio-safety and ethics debate.”

The USA has also incorporated ELSI activities into synthetic biology projects. The Synthetic Biology Engineering Research Center (SynBERC; Berkeley, CA, USA), funded by the US National Science Foundation (NSF; Arlington, VA, USA), has involved collaborations between the natural and human sciences from the outset. Unlike Europe, the USA has seen no bitter and divisive debate about GM crops. Instead, the ELSI component of SynBERC seems to mirror a similar ELSI component of nanotechnology (see for example http://cns.asu.edu/).

These examples are just a selection of the initiatives where funding agencies are ensuring that consideration of ELSIs relating to synthetic biology are integral to the development of the scientific research. This generates various questions for social scientists: why is this happening? Why are social scientists being invited to join the natural scientists? What role are they expected to play? When these questions are asked in a European context, the most common answer is that scientists and policy makers want to avoid another failed GM crop debate. Those who provide the funding for synthetic biology hope that by involving social scientists, ethicists and philosophers at an early stage, they will prevent such a failure from happening again.

Given the increasing involvement of researchers from the social sciences in synthetic biology, we are left with the question of how these social scientists should become involved. Here we put forward two contrasting ways of imagining a social scientist’s role in a synthetic biology research programme: a ‘contributor’ and a ‘collaborator’.

A ‘contributor’ is a social scientist, who, as the name implies, contributes to and facilitates the progress of the field. A contributor can be easily ‘plugged in’ to ongoing debates to cover the ethical, legal and social implications of research. The involvement of a contributor is often accompanied by the assumption that those who study the ‘social’ dimensions of a scientific field also have the competence needed to cover the social, legal, regulatory, philosophical and ethical perspectives; the inclusion of such a ‘jack-of-all-trades’ thus means that input from other experts is not required. In fact, ‘ethicist’ is sometimes used as a catch-all term for those who study new technologies and who are not scientists or engineers.

A ‘contributor’ studies the effects or consequences of scientific research. Indeed, ELSI stands for Ethical, Legal and Social *Implications*, which implies that once the natural scientists have done their work, the social scientists arrive to explore the implications of this work for society, perhaps by drawing analogies with similar technological developments in the past. The hope is that an early prediction of the possible negative implications of new technologies may help to prevent them.

Another way of ‘contributing’ to synthetic biology is to represent the ‘public’. At one UK synthetic biology conference, social scientists were labelled as “members of society” in the programme. Obviously, the organizers assumed that the social scientists represented society more than the scientists and engineers at the conference, and thought perhaps that their presence democratised the proceedings.

Similar attitudes towards social scientists are found in the nanotechnology field; McNaughten et al. (2005) argue that this relies on “[t]he appeal to social scientists as experts in the study of public opinion and political mobilization processes” with the aspiration that “such socially sensitive intelligence may help avoid future disruptive public controversy." Although it may not be accurate to label social scientists as representatives of the public in this way, it demonstrates recognition of a 'public' voice that needs to be taken into account.

Another imagined role for the social scientist is to be a 'broker', 'translator' or 'facilitator' between different groups of actors, particularly scientists and publics. Social scientists have played this role in the nanotech debate where their knowledge of the field has allowed them to "better elaborate assessment of societal impacts and interact with publics accordingly" (Barden et al., 2008). The idea here is that the social scientist can transmit scientific knowledge to the public, and, vice versa, knowledge about public attitudes to the scientists and policy makers.

The role of 'contributor' is not the only one that social scientists can play in new scientific fields, however. An alternative view sees them as 'collaborators', which we define as involvement that can potentially influence the scientific knowledge that is produced. For a collaborator, the demand for social scientific input into debates about synthetic biology is a unique opportunity. The UK's research councils require an ELSI component in network proposals in synthetic biology, and, although this could end up as a token contribution, it could also become a more genuinely collaborative exercise. There is an opportunity for authentically interdisciplinary work to take place that does not just follow the scientific research, but interacts with it. This is made more likely because social scientists are being involved in synthetic biology at the 'upstream' end, when the research is in its early stages.

Much of the literature that discusses disruptive technologies, such as GM crops and nanotechnology, suggests that the role of the social scientist in these situations should be to explore the normative assumptions that lie behind the choices that are made, or to engage in 'opening up', as Stirling (2005) puts it, which involves asking broader questions that go beyond the specific technology under scrutiny, such as questions about the aims of scientific research, and what is meant by 'good science' (Wilsdon et al., 2005). This is far from merely reflecting on the 'implications' of a technology on society.

Other commentators talk about the importance of making scientists "more self-aware of their own taken-for-granted expectations, visions, and imaginations of the ultimate ends of knowledge" (MacNaughten et al., 2005). The objective of such processes is to create 'citizen scientists' who become "sensitised through engagement to wider social imaginations" (Wilsdon et al., 2005), and who reflect on the social and ethical dimensions of their work. We think that this attempt to examine one's own assumptions—sometimes called 'reflexivity'—can go beyond facilitating social and ethical reflection amongst natural scientists and engineers, however. Discussions about implicit assumptions could potentially enable both scientists *and* social scientists to imagine their work differently, in ways that are not habitual and familiar. This 'reciprocal reflexivity' could contribute to a new set of expectations about the research.

There are positive indications that such attempts to engage in reciprocal reflexivity may work. The synthetic biology community is remarkably open to collaboration with people from outside the field, and keen to initiate discussions of their work. In our involvement in synthetic biology, we have already come across some possibilities for genuine collaboration.

Synthetic biology is therefore a fascinating field not only for biologists and engineers, but also for social scientists, because the anticipation of its ethical, legal and social implications is becoming institutionalised. It is thus important for social scientists to define their role more proactively in these emerging configurations, because the role they imagine for themselves and the role that other groups imagine for them may differ. We should also be aware that there have been similar discussions in other emerging scientific fields, and that much can be learnt from work on other potentially disruptive new technologies.

As we have shown, the role of a social scientist in synthetic biology can be defined either as a contributor—an easily plugged-in ELSI expert, who enters the scene after the scientific knowledge has been produced—or as a collaborator. As a contributor, they may represent the public, or become a translator between the natural scientists and the public. But we would argue that the role of a collaborator—as an alternative way to understand social scientific involvement in synthetic biology—is preferable, as it represents a genuine opportunity for truly collaborative work. This could involve scrutinising the assumptions underlying the research of both natural and social scientists, and challenging habitual ways of thinking among both groups. Perhaps the involvement of social scientists in synthetic biology could lead to the development of a new form of reciprocally reflexive science that brings about novel forms of collaboration, learns from previous problems, and helps to create a more ethically acceptable and socially useful field of study and application.

Jane Calvert is a Research Fellow at the Innogen Centre, Institute for the Study of Science, Technology and Innovation (ISSTI), University of Edinburgh. Email: jane.calvert@ed.ac.uk.

Paul Martin is a Reader in Science and Technology Studies and Deputy Director of the Institute for Science and Society, University of Nottingham. Email: paul.martin@nottigham.ac.uk

REFERENCES:

Barden D, Fisher E, Selin C, Guston DH (2008) Anticipatory Governance of Nanotechnology: Foresight, Engagement, and Integration. In: Hackett P, Amsterdamska O, Lynch M, Wajcman J (Eds) *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press: 979-1000

BBSRC (2008) Synthetic Biology: Linking bioscience, engineering and computer sciences to develop rationally designed biological parts, devices and systems http://www.bbsrc.ac.uk/publications/corporate/synthetic_biology.pdf

De Vriend H (2006) *Constructing Life. Early social reflections on the emerging field of synthetic biology*. The Hague, the Netherlands: Rathenau Institute

Endy D (2005) Foundations for engineering biology. *Nature* 438: 449-453

ETC Group (2006) *Global Coalition Sounds the Alarm on Synthetic Biology, Demands Oversight and Societal Debate*. Ottawa, ON, Canada: ETC Group, www.etcgroup.org

Garfinkel MS, Endy D, Epstein GL, Friedman RM (2007) *Synthetic Genomics: Options for Governance* Rockville, MD, USA: J. Craig Venter Institute

Macnaghten P, Kearnes MB, Wynne B (2005) Nanotechnology, governance and public deliberation: what role for the social sciences? *Science Communication* 27: 268-287

O'Malley M, Powell A, Davies J, Calvert J (2008) Knowledge-making distinctions in synthetic biology. *BioEssays* 30: 57–65

Stirling A (2005) Opening up or closing down? Analysis, participation and power in the social appraisal of technology. In: Leach M, Scoones I, Wynne B (Eds.) *Citizenship and Globalisation*. London, UK: Zed: 218-31

Wilsdon J, Wynne B, Stilgoe J (2005) *The Public Value of Science*. London, UK: Demos